arXiv:alg-geom/9612018v2 20 Jan 1997

EFFECTIVE BASE POINT FREENESS ON A NORMAL SURFACE

Takeshi Kawachi

Department of Mathematics, Tokyo Institute of Technology

Abstract. We prove effective base point freeness of the adjoint linear system on normal surfaces with a boundary.

0. Introduction

Let Y be a compact normal two dimensional projective variety over $\mathbb{C}$ (we call it "normal surface" for short). Let $y \in Y$ be a given point, and D be a nef and big $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on Y such that $K_Y + \lceil D \rceil$ is a Cartier divisor, There is various numerical criteria on D when the adjoint linear system $|K_Y + \lceil D \rceil|$ is free at y. The main theorem includes all earlier result and gives the first effective version if y is log-terminal singularity.

To describe the main theorem we prepare notation.

Definition. Let Y be a normal surface, and B be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on Y. Let y be a point on Y. Then the triple (Y, B, y) is said to be a germ of *quasi-log-terminal* singularity if the following conditions are satisfied:

(1) $[B] = 0$, where $[B]$ is the integral part of B.
(2) Let $f\colon X \to Y$ be the minimal resolution of y (if y is a smooth point then let f be the blowing-up at y). If we write

$$K_X = f^*(K_Y + B) + \sum a_j F_j \quad (\text{for } a_j \in \mathbb{Q})$$

then $a_j > -1$ whenever F_j is f-exceptional.

Remark. The differences with "log-terminal" are:

(1) We don't mention where $K_Y + B$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier or not. The pull-back and the intersection are used by Mumford's $\mathbb{Q}$-valued pull-back and intersection theory.
(2) f is only "minimal resolution". Thus the $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor $\sum a_j F_j$ may not be normal crossings. Hence "quasi-log-terminal" may not be "log-terminal" (cf. [KMM]).
(3) If (Y, B, y) is quasi-log-terminal then $(Y, 0, y)$ which is ignored the boundary, is log-terminal.

Typeset by $\mathcal{AMS}$-TEX

Let (Y, B, y) be a germ of normal surface singularity with a boundary B, and let $f\colon X \to Y$ be the minimal resolution of y (if y is a smooth point then the blowing-up at y). Let Z is the fundamental cycle of y (if y is a smooth point then the exceptional divisor of f). Let $\Delta_y = f^*K_Y - K_X$. Δ_y is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor if y is singular, and $\Delta_y = -Z$ if y is smooth.

Definition.

$$\delta_y = \begin{cases} -(Z-\Delta_y)^2, & \text{if } y \text{ is quasi-log-terminal} \\ 0, & \text{if } y \text{ is not quasi-log-teminal} \end{cases}$$

Definition. We define

$$\mu(B, y) = \max\{\mu \mid \mu(Z - \Delta_y) \leq f^*B\}$$

Remark.

(1) This δ_y satisfies $0 \leq \delta_y \leq 4$ ([KM]).
(2) If y is a smooth point then $2\mu = \mathrm{mult}_y B$. If y is quasi-log-terminal then $\mu < 1$.

The main result is the following.

Theorem. *Let (Y, B) be a normal surface with a boundary B and assume that $[B] = 0$. Let M be a Cartier divisor on Y such that $M - (K_Y + B)$ is nef big. Let D be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on Y which is $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly equivalent to $M - (K_Y + B)$. Let y be a point on Y. Let $\mu = \mu(B, y)$. Assume that $D^2 > (1-\mu)^2\delta_y$. If $DC \geq (1-\mu)\delta_y/2$ for all curves C in Y such that $y \in C$ then the linear system $|M|$ is free at y. Furthermore if y is a singular point which is not of type A_n then $|M|$ is free at y.*

We can get the following immediately.

Corollary. *Let Y be a normal surface. Let D be a nef $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on Y such that $K_Y + \lceil D \rceil$ is Cartier. Let y be a point on Y. Let $B = \lceil D \rceil - D$ and $\mu = \mu(B, y)$ Assume that $D^2 > (1-\mu)^2\delta_y$. If $DC \geq (1-\mu)\delta_y/2$ for all curves C in Y such that $y \in C$ then the linear system $|K_Y + \lceil D \rceil$ is free at y.*

Remark. If y is a smooth point or a rational double point then this theorem is essentially the theorem of Ein-Lazarsfeld ([EL]). If y is not a quasi-log-teminal point then the result are proved in [ELM]. If $B = 0$ then the result is described in [KM].

In section 1, we remark the facts about quasi-log-terminal singularity. These are used by the proof of the main theorem. In section 2, we prove the theorem.

1. Facts about quasi-log-terminal singularity

Throughout this section, let (Y, B, y) be a germ of quasi-log-terminal surface singularity. Let $\Delta_y = f^*K_Y - K_X = \sum a_j\Delta_j$ where Δ_i is an irreducible exceptional divisor lying over y. Let $B = B_y + B'$ and $f^*B_y = \widetilde{B_y} + {B_y}^{\mathrm{exc}} = \widetilde{B_y} + \sum b_j\Delta_j$ where B_y consists of the components which passing through y, B' is disjoint from y and $\widetilde{B_y}$ is the proper transformation of B_y. Let Z be the fundamental cycle of y. Hence we have

$$f^*(K_Y + B) = K_X + \widetilde{B_y} + \Delta_y + {B_y}^{\mathrm{exc}} + f^*B'.$$

First we bound the value of $\mu(B,y)$. we recall the definition of $\mu(B,y)$.

$$\mu(B,y) = \max\{\mu \mid \mu(Z-\Delta_y) \le f^*B\}$$

Lemma 1. *If (Y,B,y) is quasi-log-terminal then $\mu(B,y) < 1$.*

Proof. If $\mu(B,y) \ge 1$ then ${B_y}^{\mathrm{exc}} \ge Z - \Delta_y$. Hence we have $\Delta_y + {B_y}^{\mathrm{exc}} \ge Z$. On the other hand, since (Y,B,y) is quasi-log-terminal, all coefficients of $\Delta_y + {B_y}^{\mathrm{exc}}$ must be less than 1. That is contradiction. □

Since B is an effective divisor, ${B_y}^{\mathrm{exc}}$ is also effective. Therefore all coefficients of Δ_y are less than 1. This is the case of classical "log-terminal" surface singularity without boundary.

We defined $\delta_y = -(Z-\Delta_y)^2$. This is bounded by the following lemma (cf. [KM]).

Lemma 2. *$0 < \delta_y < 2$ if y is log-terminal but not a smooth or a rational double point.*

Proof. Since the intersection matrix $\|\Delta_i\Delta_j\|$ is negative definite and $Z-\Delta_y$ is effective and non-zero, we have $\delta_y > 0$. On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(Z-\Delta_y)^2 &= Z(Z-\Delta_y) - \Delta_y(Z-\Delta_y)\\ &= Z(Z+K_X) + K_X(Z-\Delta_y)\\ &> Z(Z+K_X) = 2\,Pa(Z) - 2.\end{aligned}$$

Since the log-terminal singularity is the rational singularity, we have $Pa(Z) = 0$ by [A]. Therefore we have $\delta_y < 2$. □

It is easy to prove that $\delta_y = 4$ if y is a smooth point and that $\delta_y = 2$ if y is a rational double point.

Let C be an irreducible divisor on Y and $y \in C$. Let $f^*C = \widetilde{C} + \sum c_{i,j}\Delta_j$, and $\widetilde{C}\Delta_i = 1$ for an i and $\widetilde{C}\Delta_j = 0$ for $j \ne i$. That is, we assume that $\widetilde{C}$ meets only Δ_i. Next, we study the value $a_i + c_{i,i}$. Since all log-terminal singularities are classified in [B], we examine it in each cases. we set indexes as in Appendix.

1.1 The case of type A_n. Let $A = A(w_1,\dots,w_n)$ be the intersection matrix of type A_n where $w_i = -\Delta_i^2$.

$$A(w_1,\dots,w_n) = \begin{pmatrix} -w_1 & 1 & 0 & 0\\ 1 & -w_2 & \ddots & 0\\ 0 & \ddots & \ddots & 1\\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -w_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $a(w_1,\dots,w_n) = \det A(w_1,\dots,w_n)$, and we define $a() = 1$ for convention.

Let $\widetilde{A}_{ij}$ be the (i,j)-component of A^{-1}. Suppose $j<i$ then we have

$$\widetilde{A}_{ij}=\frac{1}{\det A}(-1)^{i+j}\begin{vmatrix} -w_1 & 1 & 0 & & & & & & 0\\ 1 & \ddots & 1 & 0 & & & & & \\ 0 & 1 & -w_{j-1} & 1 & 0 & 0 & & & \\ & 0 & 0 & 1 & -w_{j+1} & 1 & 0 & & \\ & & & 0 & \ddots & -w_{i-1} & 0 & & \\ & & & & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & \\ & & & & & 0 & -w_i & \ddots & 0\\ & & & & & 0 & 1 & \ddots & 1\\ & 0 & & & & & 0 & 1 & -w_n \end{vmatrix}$$

$$=\frac{1}{\det A}(-1)^{i+j}a(w_1,\dots,w_{j-1})a(w_{i+1},\dots,w_n).$$

If $j>i$ then we have the following as same as above.

$$\widetilde{A}_{ij}=\frac{1}{\det A}(-1)^{i+j}a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-1})a(w_{j+1},\dots,w_n).$$

Also we have

$$\widetilde{A}_{ii}=\frac{1}{\det A}a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-1})a(w_{i+1},\dots,w_n).$$

Since

$$A(w_1,\dots,w_n)\begin{pmatrix}a_1\\ \vdots\\ a_n\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}2-w_1\\ \vdots\\ 2-w_n\end{pmatrix},$$

we have the following.

$$\begin{aligned}a_i&=\sum_{j=1}^{i-1}\widetilde{A}_{ij}(2-w_j)+\widetilde{A}_{ii}(2-w_i)+\sum_{j=i+1}^{n}\widetilde{A}_{ij}(2-w_j)\\ &=\frac{1}{\det A}\big\{a(w_{i+1},\dots,w_n)\big((-1)^{i+1}(2-w_1)+\cdots+(-1)^{2i-1}a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-2})(2-w_{i-1})\big)+\\ &\qquad a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-1})a(w_{i+1},\dots,w_n)(2-w_i)+\\ &\qquad a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-1})\big((-1)^{2i+1}a(w_{i+2},\dots,w_n)(2-w_{i+1})+\cdots+(-1)^{i+n}(2-w_n)\big)\big\}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $a(w_1,\dots,w_j)=-w_ja(w_1,\dots,w_{j-1})-a(w_1,\dots,w_{j-2})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&(-1)^{i+1}(2-w_1)+(-1)^{i+2}a(w_1)(2-w_2)+\cdots+(-1)^{2i-1}a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-2})(2-w_{i-1})\\ &=(-1)^{i+1}\big\{2-w_1+(-1)(2a(w_1)+a()+a(w_1,w_2))+\cdots+\\ &\qquad(-1)^{i-2}(2a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-2})+a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-3})+a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-1}))\big\}\\ &=(-1)^{i+1}\big(1+(-1)^{i-2}(a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-2})+a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-1}))\big)\\ &=(-1)^{i+1}-a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-2})-a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-1}).\end{aligned}$$

We also have the following by same calculation.

$$\begin{aligned}&(-1)^{2i+1}a(w_{i+2},\dots,w_n)(2-w_{i+1})+\cdots+(-1)^{i+n}(2-w_n)\\&=-a(w_{i+1},\dots,w_n)-a(w_{i+2},\dots,w_n)+(-1)^{i+n}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}a_i=&\frac{1}{\det A}\big\{a(w_{i+1},\dots,w_n)((-1)^{i+1}-a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-2})-a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-1}))+\\&\quad a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-1})a(w_{i+1},\dots,w_n)(2-w_i)+\\&\quad a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-1})((-1)^{i+n}-a(w_{i+1},\dots,w_n)-a(w_{i+2},\dots,w_n))\big\}\\=&\frac{1}{\det A}\big\{(-1)^{i+1}a(w_{i+1},\dots,w_n)+(-1)^{i+n}a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-1})\\&\quad-a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-2})a(w_{i+1},\dots,w_n)-a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-1})a(w_{i+1},\dots,w_n)w_i\\&\quad-a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-1})a(w_{i+2},\dots,w_n)\big\}\\=&1+\frac{1}{\det A}\{(-1)^{i+1}a(w_{i+1},\dots,w_n)+(-1)^{i+n}a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-1})\}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $(A(w_1,\dots,w_n)(c_{i,j}))_j=-1$ if $j=i$ and $=0$ if $j\neq i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}c_{i,j}&=-\widetilde{A}_{ji}\\&=\frac{1}{\det A}(-1)^{i+j+1}\begin{cases}a(w_1,\dots,w_{j-1})a(w_{i+1},\dots,w_n), & \text{if } j\le i\\ a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-1})a(w_{j+1},\dots,w_n), & \text{if } j>i.\end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have the following.

$$\begin{aligned}a_i+c_{i,i}&=1+\frac{1}{|\det A|}(-|a(w_{i+1},\dots,w_n)|-|a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-1})|+\\&\qquad|a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-1})||a(w_{i+1},\dots,w_n)|)\\&=1+\frac{1}{|\det A|}\big((|a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-1})|-1)(|a(w_{i+1},\dots,w_n)|-1)-1\big)\end{aligned}$$

Hence we get the following proposition.

Proposition 1. *Let C as above. Assume y is of type A_n. If $n\ge 3$ and $i\neq 1,n$ then $a_i+c_{i,i}\ge 1$.*
If $i=1$ or n then $a_i+c_{i,i}=1-1/|\det A|$ (for $n\ge 1$).

In the case of type A_n we have $\delta_y=2-a_1-a_n$. Indeed, since $(\Delta_y-Z)\Delta_i=2-w_i-(-w_i+2)=0$ if $i\neq 1,n$ and $(\Delta_y-Z)\Delta_i=1$ if $i=1$ or n, we get the equation $\delta_y=2-a_1-a_n$.

1.2 The case of type D_n. Let $D = D(w_1, \ldots, w_{n-2})$ be the intersection matrix of type D_n where $w_i = -\Delta_i^2$.

$$D(w_1, \ldots, w_n) = \begin{pmatrix} -w_1 & 1 & 0 & & & 0 \\ 1 & -w_2 & \ddots & 0 & & \\ 0 & \ddots & \ddots & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ & 0 & 1 & -w_{n-2} & 1 & 1 \\ & & 0 & 1 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & & 0 & 1 & 0 & -2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $d(w_1, \ldots, w_{n-2}) = \det D(w_1, \ldots, w_{n-2})$, and we define $d() = 4$ for convention.

Let $\widetilde{D}_{ij}$ be the (i,j)-component of D^{-1}. As same as of type A_n, we have

$$\widetilde{D}_{ij} = \frac{1}{\det D} \begin{cases} (-1)^{i+j} a(w_1, \ldots, w_{j-1}) d(w_{i+1}, \ldots, w_{n-2}), & i \le n-2, j \le i \\ (-1)^{i+j} a(w_1, \ldots, w_{i-1}) d(w_{j+1}, \ldots, w_{n-2}), & i \le n-2, i < j \le n-2. \end{cases}$$

Let $i \le n-2, j = n-1$. In this case we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{D}_{i,n-1} &= \frac{1}{\det D}(-1)^{i+n-1} \begin{vmatrix} -w_1 & 1 & 0 & & & & 0 \\ 1 & \ddots & 1 & 0 & & & \\ 0 & \ddots & -w_{i-1} & 0 & & & \\ & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & & \\ & & 0 & -w_{i+1} & \ddots & 0 & 0 \\ & & 0 & 1 & -w_{n-2} & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & & & 0 & 1 & 0 & -2 \end{vmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{\det D}(-1)^{i+n-1}(-2) a(w_1, \cdots, w_{i-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Also we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{D}_{in} &= \widetilde{D}_{n-1,i} = \widetilde{D}_{ni} \\ &= \frac{1}{\det D}(-1)^{i+n-1}(-2) a(w_1, \cdots, w_{i-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Now we suppose $i, j \ge n-1$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{D}_{n-1,n-1} &= \widetilde{D}_{n,n} \\ &= \frac{1}{\det D} \begin{vmatrix} -w_1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & \ddots & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -w_{n-2} & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -2 \end{vmatrix} = \frac{1}{\det D} a(w_1, \ldots, w_{n-2}, 2). \end{aligned}$$

$$\widetilde{D}_{n-1,n} = \widetilde{D}_{n,n-1}$$
$$= \frac{1}{\det D}(-1)\begin{vmatrix} -w_1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & \ddots & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -w_{n-2} & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{vmatrix} = \frac{1}{\det D}a(w_1,\dots,w_{n-3}).$$

Note that there is an equation

$$d(w_1,\dots,w_{n-2}) = -4a(w_1,\dots,w_{n-2},1).$$

Now we calculate the value a_i. The calculation will proceed as same as of type A_n. But one thing differs, that is $d(w_{n-2}) = -4w_2 + 4$. For $i \le n-2$, we have the following.

$$\begin{aligned} a_i &= \frac{1}{\det D}\big\{d(w_{i+1},\dots,w_{n-2})((-1)^{i+1} - a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-2}) - a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-1}))+ \\ &\qquad a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-1})d(w_{i+1},\dots,w_{n-2})(2-w_i) \\ &\qquad - a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-1})(d(w_{i+1},\dots,w_{n-2}) + d(w_{i+2},\dots,w_{n-2}))\big\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\det D}\big\{(-1)^{i+1}d(w_{i+1},\dots,w_{n-2}) - a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-2})d(w_{i+1},\dots,w_{n-2}) \\ &\qquad - a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-1})d(w_{i+1},\dots,w_{n-2})w_i - a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-1})d(w_{i+2},\dots,w_{n-2})\big\} \\ &= 1 + \frac{1}{\det D}(-1)^{i+1}d(w_{i+1},\dots,w_{n-2}) = 1 - \frac{1}{|\det D|}|d(w_{i+1},\dots,w_{n-2})|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $c_{i,i} = -\widetilde{D}_{ii}$, we have the following.

$$a_i + c_{i,i} = 1 + \frac{1}{|\det D|}|d(w_{i+1},\dots,w_{n-2})|\big(|a(w_1,\dots,w_{i-1})| - 1\big).$$

For $i = n-1, n$, we have $a_{n-1} = a_n = a_{n-2}/2$. Hence we have

$$a_{n-1} = a_n = \frac{1}{2} + (-1)^{n-1}\frac{2}{\det D} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{|\det D|}.$$

Therefore we have the following.

$$\begin{aligned} a_{n-1} + c_{n-1,n-1} &= a_n + c_{n,n} \\ &= 1 + \frac{1}{\det D}\{2(-1)^{n-1} - \frac{1}{2}d(w_1,\dots,w_{n-2}) - a(w_1,\dots,w_{n-2},2)\} \\ &= 1 + \frac{1}{\det D}\{2(-1)^{n-1} + 2a(w_1,\dots,w_{n-2},1) - a(w_1,\dots,w_{n-2},2)\} \\ &= 1 + \frac{1}{\det D}\{2(-1)^{n-1} - 2a(w_1,\dots,w_{n-2}) - 2a(w_1,\dots,w_{n-3})+ \\ &\qquad 2a(w_1,\dots,w_{n-2}) + a(w_1,\dots,w_{n-3})\} \\ &= 1 + \frac{1}{\det D}\{2(-1)^{n-1} - a(w_1,\dots,w_{n-3})\} \\ &= 1 + \frac{1}{|\det D|}(|a(w_1,\dots,w_{n-3})| - 2) \ge 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we get the following proposition.

Proposition 2. *Let C as above. If y is of type D_n then $a_i + c_{i,i} \geq 1$ for all i.*

1.3 The case of type E_n. If the dual graph is in the Appendix then we write $(m; a, b, c; d, e)$ or may write $(m; a, b, c; d, e; -2)$. We set indexes i as in the Appendix. There are only 15 types in all by the classification ([B]). Hence we can calculate $a_i + c_{i,i}$ directly. The result is in Appendix.

Hence we get the following proposition.

Proposition 3. *Let C as above. If y is of type E_n then $a_i + c_i > 1$ for all i.*

2. Proof of the Theorem

We recall notation. Let (Y, B) be a normal surface with a boundary B such that $[B] = 0$. Let M be a Cartier divisor on Y. Let D be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on Y, $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly equivalent to the nef big divisor $M - (K_Y + B)$. Let y be a point of Y. Let $f\colon X \to Y$ be the global minimal resolution, if y is a smooth point, f factors the blowing-up at y. Let $\Delta = f^*K_Y - K_X$. Let Δ_y be the components of Δ supported on $f^{-1}(y)$, and $\Delta' = \Delta - \Delta_y$. Let Z be the fundamental cycle of y. Let $\mu = \mu(B, y)$, where $\mu(B, y) = \max\{\mu \mid \mu(Z - \Delta_y) \leq f^*B\}$. Let $\delta_y = -(Z - \Delta_y)^2$ if y is quasi-log-terminal, and $\delta_y = 0$ if y is not quasi-log-terminal. Let $B = B_y + B'$ where B_y consists of the component which contain y, and B' is disjoint from y. Let $f^*B_y = \widetilde{B_y} + {B_y}^{\mathrm{exc}}$ where $\widetilde{B}$ is the proper transformation of B_y, and $f({B_y}^{\mathrm{exc}}) = \{y\}$. Since $M \sim K_Y + D + B$ is Cartier, $f^*(K_Y + D + B) = K_X + f^*(D + B) + \Delta$ is integral. Hence $D + B$ is also integral coefficients, thus $\lceil D \rceil = D + B$.

First we treat the case which y is not quasi-log-terminal. In this case, we assume that $D^2 > 0$ and $DC \geq 0$ for all curve $C \ni y$, because we defined $\delta_y = 0$. Since D is nef and big, this always hold. Hence it is sufficient to prove that y is not a base point of $|M|$.

Since f^*D is nef and big, we have $H^1(X, K_X + \lceil f^*D \rceil) = 0$ by Sakai's lemma [S1] where $\lceil\ \rceil$ means the "round-up". On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} K_X + \lceil f^*D \rceil &= \lceil K_X + f^*D \rceil = \lceil f^*(K_Y + B) - \Delta - f^*B + f^*D \rceil \\ &= \lceil f^*(K_Y + \lceil D \rceil) - (\Delta_y + {B_y}^{\mathrm{exc}}) - \Delta' - f^*B' \rceil \\ &= f^*(K_Y + \lceil D \rceil) - \lfloor \Delta_y + {B_y}^{\mathrm{exc}} \rfloor - \lfloor \Delta' + f^*B' \rfloor . \end{aligned}$$

Since y is not quasi-log-terminal, the round-down $\lfloor \Delta_y + {B_y}^{\mathrm{exc}} \rfloor \neq 0$. Let $S = \lfloor \Delta_y + {B_y}^{\mathrm{exc}} \rfloor$ and $T = \lfloor \Delta' + f^*B' \rfloor$. Hence we have a surjection

$$H^0(X, f^*(K_Y + \lceil D \rceil) - T) \to H^0(S, (f^*(K_Y + \lceil D \rceil) - T)|_S) \to 0.$$

Since $f(S) = \{y\}$, $\mathcal{O}_S((f^*(K_Y + \lceil D \rceil) - T)|_S)$ is trivial. Hence we get a section of $\mathcal{O}_X(f^*(K_Y + \lceil D \rceil) - T)$ which does not vanish at any point of $Supp\, S$. Therefore we get a global section of $\mathcal{O}_X(f^*(K_Y + \lceil D \rceil))$ which does not vanish on $f^{-1}(y)$ by multiplying the global section of $\mathcal{O}_X(T)$.

From now we assume that y is quasi-log-terminal. Let $D = D_y + D'$ where all irreducible divisors in D_y contain y and D' is the others. Let $f^*D_y = \widetilde{D_y} + {D_y}^{\mathrm{exc}} = \sum d_i D_i + \sum d'_j \Delta_j$.

Let $f^*B_y = \sum b_i D_i + \sum b'_j \Delta_j$. Let $\Delta_y = \sum a_j \Delta_j$. Since $D^2 > -((1-\mu)(Z-\Delta_y))^2$, $f^*D - (1-\mu)(Z-\Delta_y)$ is big. Hence if necessary, we change D by $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly equivalence and we assume $D_y \neq 0$. We define the number

$$c = \min\left\{ \frac{1-b_i}{d_i}, \frac{1-a_j-b'_j}{d'_j} \right\}$$

Since $d_i, d'_j > 0$, $0 \leq b_i < 1$ and $a_j + b'_j < 1$ we have $c > 0$.

Lemma 3. $c \leq 1/2$.

Proof. Since $D^2 > -((1+\varepsilon)(1-\mu)(Z-\Delta_y))^2$ for sufficiently small ε, we have $D - (1+\varepsilon)(1-\mu)(Z-\Delta_y) > 0$. Hence we have $d'_j - (1-\mu)(z_j - a_j) > 0$ where $Z = \sum z_j \Delta_j$. Thus $d'_j + a_j - z_j + \mu(z_j - a_j) > 0$. By the definition of μ, we have $b'_j \geq \mu(z_j - a_j)$. Hence we have $d'_j + a_j - z_j + b'_j > 0$. Therefore $d'_j + a_j + b'_j > z_j \geq 1$ because z_j is positive integer. On the other hand, Since $K_Y + \lceil D \rceil = K_Y + D + B$ is Cartier, $f^*D + f^*B + \Delta = f^*(K_Y + D + B) - K_X$ is integral divisor. Hence $d'_j + a_j + b'_j$ is also integral. Since $d'_j + a_j + b'_j \geq 2$, we have $2(1 - a_j/2 - b'_j/2) \leq d'_j$. Thus we have

$$c \leq \frac{1-a_j-b'_j}{d'_j} \leq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{a_j + b'_j}{2d'_j} \leq \frac{1}{2}. \quad \square$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} R &= f^*D - cf^*D = f^* \lceil D \rceil + \Delta - f^*B - cf^*D - \Delta \\ &= f^* \lceil D \rceil + \Delta - \left(\sum (b_i + cd_i) D_i + \sum (b'_j + cd'_j + a_j) \Delta_j \right) - (f^*B' + f^*D' + \Delta'). \end{aligned}$$

Since $f^* \lceil D \rceil + \Delta = f^*(K_Y + \lceil D \rceil) - K_X$ is Cartier,

$$\begin{aligned} \lceil R \rceil &= f^* \lceil D \rceil + \Delta - \left\lfloor \sum (b_i + cd_i) D_i + \sum (b'_j + cd'_j + a_j) \Delta_j \right\rfloor - \lfloor f^*B' + f^*D' + \Delta' \rfloor \\ &= f^* \lceil D \rceil + \Delta - (D_1 + \cdots + D_s) - E' - Q \end{aligned}$$

where $\lfloor \sum (b_i + cd_i) D_i \rfloor = D_1 + \cdots + D_s$, $\left\lfloor \sum (b'_j + cd'_j + a_j) \Delta_j \right\rfloor = E'$, and $\lfloor f^*B' + f^*D' + \Delta' \rfloor = Q$.

Suppose $E' \neq 0$. Since $R = (1-c) f^*D$ is nef big and $D_1, \ldots, D_s$ are not appear in the fractional part of R, we have $H^1(X, K_X + \lceil R \rceil + D_1 + \cdots + D_s) = 0$ by Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing theorem. Hence we have the surjection

$$H^0(X, f^*(K_Y + \lceil D \rceil) - Q) \to H^0(E', (f^*(K_Y + \lceil D \rceil) - Q)|_{E'}) \to 0.$$

Since $f(E') = \{y\}$ and Q is disjoint from y, we get a global section of $K_Y + \lceil D \rceil$ which is not vanish at y.

Now we assume $E' = 0$. Note that the minimality of c induce that $b_i + cd_i \leq 1$. Thus the minimal value c is obtained by $(1 - b_i)/d_i$, hence $s \geq 1$. By Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing theorem, we have

$$H^0(X, K_X + \lceil R \rceil + D_2 + \cdots + D_s) = H^0(K_X + f^* \lceil D \rceil + \Delta - D_1 - Q) = 0.$$

Thus there is the surjection

$$H^0(X, K_X + f^* \lceil D \rceil + \Delta - Q) \to H^0(D_1, K_{D_1} + (f^* \lceil D \rceil + \Delta - D_1 - Q)|_{D_1}) \to 0.$$

So it is sufficient to prove $\lceil R \rceil D_1 > 1$. Indeed, if $\lceil R \rceil D_1 > 1$ then $\lceil R \rceil D_1 \geq 2$ because $\lceil R \rceil$ is Cartier. Thus $(f^* \lceil D \rceil + \Delta - D_1 - Q)D_1 \geq \lceil R \rceil D_1 \geq 2$. Hence we get the nowhere vanishing global section in $H^0(D_1, K_{D_1} + (f^* \lceil D \rceil + \Delta - D_1 - Q)|_{D_1})$. Hence we get the global section of $\mathcal{O}(f^*(K_Y + \lceil D \rceil))$ which is not vanish on D_1, especially not vanish at y.

Hence we prove $\lceil R \rceil D_1 > 1$. Remark that

$$\lceil R \rceil = R + \left\{ \sum_{i \neq 1, \ldots s} (b_i + cd_i)D_i + \sum (b'_j + cd'_j + a_j)\Delta_j + (\text{others}) \right\}$$

where $\{(\text{divisor})\}$ is the fractional part of (divisor). Since $E' = 0$, $\{\sum (b'_j + cd'_j + a_j)\Delta_j\} = \sum (b'_j + cd'_j + a_j)\Delta_j$. Therefore

$$\lceil R \rceil D_1 \geq (1 - c) f^* D D_1 + \sum (b'_j + cd'_j + a_j)\Delta_j D_1.$$

Thus it is sufficient to prove

$$(1 - c)(1 - \mu)\delta_y/2 + \sum (b'_j + cd'_j + a_j)\Delta_j D_1 > 1. \tag{1}$$

If D_1 meets more components of Δ_y then $\sum (b'_j + cd'_j + a_j)\Delta_j D_1$ is larger. Thus we assume $\Delta_i D_1 = 1$ for an i and $\Delta_i D_1 = 0$ for $j \neq i$. Let $f^* f_* D_1 = D_1 + \sum c_{i,j}\Delta_j$. Since $f^* B_y + c f^* D_y = D_1 + (\text{others})$, we have $c_{i,j} \leq b'_j + cd'_j$. But by Proposition 1 through 3, $c_{i,i} + a_i \geq 1$ if y is of type D_n or of type E_n, and if y is of type A_n and $i \neq 1, n$. They contradict to the assumption $E' = 0$. Thus we assume y is of type A_n and $j = 1, n$ or y is a smooth point.

Thus if y is of type D_n or E_n and $D^2 > (1 - \mu)^2 \delta_y$ then y is not a base point of $|M|$.

First we assume that y is a smooth point or of type A_1. In this case, $b'_1 = \mu(1 - a_1)$. Let $p = \mu(D, y)$, hence $d'_1 = p(1 - a_1)$. Let $w_1 = -\Delta_1^2$. Then we have $a_1 = 1 - 2/w_1$ and $\delta_y = 4/w_1$. Hence $\delta_y = 2(1 - a_1)$. Since $f^* D - (1 - \mu)(Z - \Delta_y)$ is big, we have $p + \mu > 1$ as in the proof of lemma 3. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lceil R \rceil D_1 &\geq (1 - c)(1 - \mu)\frac{\delta_y}{2} + (b'_1 + cd'_1 + a_1) \\
&= (1 - \mu)\frac{\delta_y}{2} + b'_1 + a_1 + (d'_1 - (1 - \mu)\frac{\delta_y}{2})c \\
&= (1 - \mu)(1 - a_1) + \mu(1 - a_1) + a_1 + (p(1 - a_1) - (1 - \mu)(1 - a_1))c \\
&= 1 + (p + \mu - 1)(1 - a_1)c > 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Next we assume that y is of type A_n and $n \geq 2$. We may change the indexes of Δ_j, we assume $a_1 \leq a_n$. We also assume that D_1 meets Δ_i where $i = 1$ or n.

Case 1: We assume that $i = n$ or $a_1 = a_n$.

It is sufficient to prove $(1-c)(1-\mu)\delta_y/2 + b'_i + cd'_i + a_i > 1$ by the inequality of (1). Since the definition of μ, we have $\mu(1-a_i) \leq b'_i$. Since $f^*D - (1-\mu)(Z - \Delta_y)$ is big, we have $d'_i > (1-\mu)(1-a_i)$. Since $\delta_y = 2 - a_1 - a_n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(1-c)(1-\mu)\delta_y/2 + b'_i + cd'_i + a_i \\
&\quad > (1-\mu)\left(1 - \frac{a_1+a_n}{2}\right) + \mu(1-a_i) + a_i + \\
&\qquad \left((1-\mu)(1-a_i) - (1-\mu)\left(1 - \frac{a_1+a_n}{2}\right)\right)c \\
&\quad = 1 - \frac{a_1+a_n}{2} + a_i + \mu\left(1 - a_i - 1 + \frac{a_1+a_n}{2}\right) + c(1-\mu)\left(1 - a_i - 1 + \frac{a_1+a_n}{2}\right) \\
&\quad = 1 + \frac{a_n - a_1}{2} - \mu\frac{a_n - a_1}{2} - c(1-\mu)\frac{a_n - a_1}{2} \quad (\text{let } i = n) \\
&\quad = 1 + (1-c)(1-\mu)\frac{a_n - a_1}{2} \geq 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Case 2: We assume that $i = 1$ and $a_1 < a_n$.

Let $B_y = bD_1 + B''$ and $ord_{\Delta_i} f^*B'' = b''_i$. Since

$$\sum (b'_i + cd'_i + a_i)\Delta_i = (f^*B_y + cf^*D_y + \Delta_y)^{\text{exc}} \geq (f^*f_*D_1 + f^*B'' + \Delta_y)^{\text{exc}},$$

we have $b'_i + cd_i + a_i \geq a_i + c_i + b''_i$. Since $a_1 + c_{1,1} = 1 - 1/|\det A|$, if $b''_1 \geq 1/|\det A|$ then $\lceil R \rceil D_1 > 1$ because $\delta_y > 0$.

Suppose that $b''_1 < 1/|\det A|$. Let $B'' = \sum b_k D_k$ and $f^*D_k = \widetilde{D_k} + \sum(c_{k_1,j} + \cdots + c_{k_{r_k},j})\Delta_j$ if $\widetilde{D_k}$ meets $\Delta_{k_1}, \ldots, \Delta_{k_{r_k}}$ counted with intersection multiplicity. Since

$$\frac{1}{|\det A|} > b''_1 = \sum_{k,i} b_k c_{k_i,1} \geq \sum_k b_k c_{n,1} r_k = \frac{\sum b_k r_k}{|\det A|},$$

we have $\beta = \sum b_k r_k < 1$. By the definition of μ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu \leq \frac{b''_n}{1-a_n} &= \frac{bc_{1,n} + \sum b_k c_{k_i,n}}{1-a_n} \leq \frac{bc_{1,n} + \sum b_k r_k c_{n,n}}{1-a_n} \\
&= \frac{bc_{1,n} + \beta c_{n,n}}{1-a_n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(1-c)(1-\mu)\frac{\delta_y}{2} \\
&\quad \geq (1-c)\left(1-\frac{bc_{1,n}+\beta c_{n,n}}{1-a_n}\right)\frac{\delta_y}{2} \\
&\quad = (1-c)\frac{\delta_y}{2(1-a_n)}((1-a_n)|\det A| - b - \beta a(w_1,\ldots,w_{n-1}))\frac{1}{|\det A|} \\
&\quad = (1-c)\frac{\delta_y}{2(1-a_n)}((1-b)+(1-\beta)a(w_1,\ldots,w_{n-1}))\frac{1}{|\det A|}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $b \leq \beta$ then

$$\begin{aligned}
(1-c)(1-\mu)\frac{\delta_y}{2} &\geq (1-c)\frac{\delta_y}{2(1-a_n)}(1-\beta)\frac{1+a(w_1,\ldots,w_{n-1})}{|\det A|} \\
&= (1-c)(1-\beta)\frac{\delta_y}{2(1-a_n)}(1-a_n) \\
&= (1-c)(1-\beta)\frac{\delta_y}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $c \leq 1/2$ by lemma 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(1-c)(1-\mu)\frac{\delta_y}{2} + \frac{\beta}{|\det A|} \\
&\quad \geq (1-\beta)\frac{\delta_y}{4} + \frac{\beta}{|\det A|} \\
&\quad = \frac{1}{|\det A|}\left(\frac{1}{4}(2+a(w_1,\ldots,w_{n-1})+a(w_2,\ldots,w_n))(1-\beta)+\beta\right) \\
&\quad \geq \frac{1}{|\det A|}\left(\frac{3}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\beta\right) \\
&\quad > \frac{1}{|\det A|}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(1-c)(1-\mu)\frac{\delta_y}{2} + b_1' + cd_1 + a_1 \\
&\qquad \geq (1-c)(1-\mu)\frac{\delta_y}{2} + a_1 + c_{1,1} + \sum b_k c_{k_i,1} \\
&\qquad \geq (1-c)(1-\mu)\frac{\delta_y}{2} + 1 - \frac{1}{|\det A|} + \frac{\beta}{|\det A|} \\
&\qquad > 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally we assume that $\beta < b$. In this case we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(1-c)(1-\mu)\frac{\delta_y}{2} \\
&\quad \geq \frac{\delta_y}{4(1-a_n)}((1-b)+(1-\beta)a(w_1,\ldots,w_{n-1}))\frac{1}{|\det A|} \\
&\quad = \frac{\delta_y}{4(1-a_n)}(1-\beta)(1+a(w_1,\ldots,w_{n-1}))\frac{1}{|\det A|} - \frac{\delta_y}{4(1-a_n)}\frac{1}{|\det A|}(b-\beta) \\
&\quad > (1-\beta)\frac{\delta_y}{4} - \frac{\delta_y}{4}\frac{1}{1+a(w_1,\ldots,w_{n-1})}(1-\beta) \\
&\quad = (1-\beta)\frac{\delta_y}{4}\left(1-\frac{1}{1+a(w_1,\ldots,w_{n-1})}\right) \\
&\quad \geq (1-\beta)\frac{\delta_y}{6}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(1-c)(1-\mu)\frac{\delta_y}{2} + \frac{\beta}{|\det A|} &> (1-\beta)\frac{\delta_y}{6} + \frac{\beta}{|\det A|} \\
&= \frac{1}{|\det A|}\left(\frac{1}{6}(2+a(w_1,\ldots,w_{n-1})+a(w_2,\ldots,w_n))(1-\beta)+\beta\right) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{|\det A|}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have

$$(1-c)(1-\mu)\frac{\delta_y}{2} + b_1' + cd_1 + a_1 > 1.$$

Thus we have $\lceil R \rceil D_1 > 1$, we complete the proof. $\square$

Appendix

type	dual graph	a_i+c_i	$x=$
1	$(m;2,2;2,2)$	$\left(1+\frac{5}{x};1+\frac{1}{3x},\frac{4}{3}+\frac{2}{x};\frac{4}{3}+\frac{2}{x},1+\frac{1}{3x};1+\frac{1}{x}\right)$	$6m-11$
2	$(m;2,2;3)$	$\left(1+\frac{5}{3x};1+\frac{1}{9x},\frac{4}{3}+\frac{2}{3x};1+\frac{1}{9x};1+\frac{1}{3x}\right)$	$2m-3$
3	$(m;3;3)$	$\left(1+\frac{5}{x};1+\frac{1}{3x};1+\frac{1}{3x};1+\frac{1}{x}\right)$	$6m-7$
4	$(m;2,2,2;2,2)$	$\left(1+\frac{11}{x};1+\frac{1}{2x},\frac{3}{2}+\frac{5}{2x},\frac{3}{2}+\frac{6}{x};\frac{4}{3}+\frac{14}{3x},1+\frac{1}{x};1+\frac{5}{2x}\right)$	$12m-23$
5	$(m;2,2,2;3)$	$\left(1+\frac{11}{x};1+\frac{1}{2x},\frac{3}{2}+\frac{5}{2x},\frac{3}{2}+\frac{6}{x};1+\frac{1}{x};1+\frac{5}{2x}\right)$	$12m-19$
6	$(m;4;2,2)$	$\left(1+\frac{11}{x};1+\frac{1}{2x};\frac{4}{3}+\frac{1}{4}3x,1+\frac{1}{x};1+\frac{5}{2x}\right)$	$12m-17$
7	$(m;4;3)$	$\left(1+\frac{11}{x};1+\frac{1}{2x};1+\frac{1}{x};1+\frac{5}{2x}\right)$	$12m-13$
8	$(m;2,2,2,2;2,2)$	$\left(1+\frac{29}{x};1+\frac{1}{x},\frac{8}{5}+\frac{22}{5x},\frac{9}{5}+\frac{51}{5x},\frac{8}{5}+\frac{92}{5x};\frac{4}{3}+\frac{38}{3x},1+\frac{3}{x};1+\frac{7}{x}\right)$	$30m-59$
9	$(m;2,2,2,2;3)$	$\left(1+\frac{29}{x};1+\frac{1}{x},\frac{8}{5}+\frac{22}{5x},\frac{9}{5}+\frac{51}{5x},\frac{8}{5}+\frac{92}{5x};1+\frac{3}{x};1+\frac{7}{x}\right)$	$30m-49$
10	$(m;2,3;2,2)$	$\left(1+\frac{29}{x};1+\frac{1}{x},\frac{6}{5}+\frac{22}{5x},\frac{4}{3}+\frac{38}{3x},1+\frac{3}{x};1+\frac{7}{x}\right)$	$30m-47$
11	$(m;2,3;3)$	$\left(1+\frac{29}{x};1+\frac{1}{x},\frac{6}{5}+\frac{22}{5x};1+\frac{3}{x};1+\frac{7}{x}\right)$	$30m-37$
12	$(m;3,2;2,2)$	$\left(1+\frac{29}{x};1+\frac{1}{x},\frac{7}{5}+\frac{51}{5x};\frac{4}{3}+\frac{38}{3x},1+\frac{3}{x};1+\frac{7}{x}\right)$	$30m-53$
13	$(m;3,2;3)$	$\left(1+\frac{29}{x};1+\frac{1}{x},\frac{7}{5}+\frac{51}{5x};1+\frac{3}{x};1+\frac{7}{x}\right)$	$30m-43$
14	$(m;5;2,2)$	$\left(1+\frac{29}{x};1+\frac{1}{x};\frac{4}{3}+\frac{38}{3x},1+\frac{3}{x};1+\frac{7}{x}\right)$	$30m-41$
15	$(m;5;3)$	$\left(1+\frac{29}{x};1+\frac{1}{x};1+\frac{3}{x};1+\frac{7}{x}\right)$	$30m-31$

References

[A] M. Artin, *On isolated rational singularities of surfaces*, Amer. J. Math. **88** (1966), 129–136.

[B] E. Brieskorn, *Rationale singularitäten komplexer flächen*, Invent. Math. **14** (1968), 336–358.

[EL] L. Ein–R. Lazarsfeld, *Global generation of puricanonical and adjoint linear series on projectiave threefolds*, Jour. AMS **6** (1993), 875–903.

[ELM] L. Ein, R. Lazarsfeld, V. Maşek, *Global generation of linear series on terminal threefolds*, International Journal of Math. **6** (1995), 1–18.

[K] T. Kawachi, *On freeness theorem of the adjoint bundle on a normal surface*, alg-geom9603022.

[KM] T. Kawachi, V. Maşek, *Reider–Type Theorems on Normal Surfaces*, Journal of Algebraic Geometry (submitting).

[KMM] Y. Kawamata–K. Matsuda–K. Matsuki, *Introduction to the Minimal Model Probrem*, Adv. Studies in Pure Math. **10** (1987), 283–360.

[R] I. Reider, *Vector bundles of rank 2 and linear systems on algebraic surfaces*, Ann. Math. **127** (1988), 309–316.

[S1] F. Sakai, *Weil divisors on normal surfaces*, Duke Math. J. **51** (1984), 877-887.

[S2] ———, *Reider-Serrano's method on normal surfaces*, Algebraic Geometry, Proceedings: L'Aquila 1988, Lect. Notes in Math. **1417** (1990), 301–319.

2-12-1 Oh-okayama, Meguro-ku, Tokyo, JAPAN, 152

E-mail address: kawachi@math.titech.ac.jp